DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 321 304 CS 507 048

AUTHOR Justice, Paula Lippard
TITLE "What She Doesn't Know Won't Hurt Her": Gender Effects on Patterns of Interpersonal Deception.
PUB DATE Nov 87
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (73rd, Boston, MA, November 5-8, 1987).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Behavior Patterns; Communication Research; *Deception; *Interpersonal Communication; Interpersonal Competence; Interpersonal Relationship; Sex Bias; *Sex Differences; *Sex Role; *Sex Stereotypes; Social Cognition

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to determine if (1) significant gender differences exist in prevalence of deception, motivation for deception, and recipients of deception; and (2) whether such differences support traditional gender role perceptions and expectations. Seventy-four subjects, 50 female and 24 male undergraduate students, recorded all instances of interpersonal deception for a period of three weeks. A total of 940 instances of deception were coded and analyzed, 618 for women and 322 for men. The records revealed significant differences between the sexes in motivation for lying as well as significant gender differences as recipients of deception. A significant difference between sexes existed for primary motivation subcategories, although very weak. Differences appeared to lie primarily in: request acceptance, avoid hurt feelings, and third party protection. Significant differences were present in the crosstabulation of recipient gender and primary motivation categories in the following subcategories: avoid hurt feelings, avoid interaction, fidelity, and worry another. These differences were even stronger for male subjects alone in the subcategories of request refusal, obligation-excuse, and resource acquisition. For female subjects alone in this category, differences emerged in control of others, self-protection and obligation-excuse. Largely these differences reflected and reinforced gender role stereotypes indicating that deception strategies are part of gender socialization. (Five tables of data are included, and 16 references are attached.) (MG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED321304

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Paula Lippard Justice
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

"What She Doesn't Know Won't Hurt Her": Gender Effects on Patterns of Interpersonal Deception

Seventy-four subjects, 50 female and 24 male undergraduate students, recorded all instances of interpersonal deception for a period of 3 weeks. Analyzed for gender differences, their records revealed significant differences between the sexes in motivation for lying as well as significant gender differences as recipients of deception. Largely these differences reflected and reinforced gender role stereotypes, indicating that deception strategies are part of gender socialization.

Paula Lippard Justice
Department of Communication Arts and Sciences
DePauw University
Greencastle, IN 46135

Home Address:
605 Ridge Ave.
Greencastle, IN 46135
317-653-7235

CS507048

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Deception in interpersonal relationships is not only common but socially acceptable (Turner, Edgely, & Olmstead, 1975), considered a possible form of communication competence (Camden, Motley, & Wilson, 1984), and a predictable response in certain social situations (Lippard, 1987). Wolk and Henley (1970) go so far as to contend that deception is indispensible, helping us to preserve our emotional equilibrium.

Patterns of interpersonal deception based on gender roles have traditionally been a critical part of communication in our society. The stereotypical dissembling of women often takes the form of appearing to be less than a mature adult--masking intelligence, technical skills, and common sense. Women are to seen unable to

make decisions, and uninterested in, uninformed about, and bewildered by such masculine spheres as business and politics, and in need of protection. Women, though permitted to be more disclosing of personal information with both genders, nevertheless are encouraged by the stereotype of a "gossipy" sister to withhold or distort self-incriminating information.

Traditional male deception, meanwhile, requires masking genuine feelings, appearing courageous and in control in the presence of both sexes. Men control information about the harsh realities of war, money, power, and sex with their "more delicate counterparts." In addition, they are to withhold and distort information in the male-dominated work sphere in order to protect and acquire resources.

To counterbalance their naive, helpless personas, women are suspected of and encouraged in the use of deceptive "feminine wiles" to manipulate men, while even the most noble "seeming" man is viewed as a deceptive and manipulative seducer of innocent virtue.

If such gender specific patterns of deception do exist, they serve to <u>reinforce traditional roles</u> and promote distrust in both same sex and opposite sex

communication. Although identification of such gender specific patterns of deception has been limited, research into the social implications of interpersonal deception has revealed that gender differences do indeed exist in the areas of detection of deception cues, the motivations for lying, the recipients of lying, and the evaluation of deception.

Rosenthal and DePaulo (1979) revealed that women are better at decoding nonverbal messages; however, although deception is revealed through nonverbal signals, men are superior at lie detection. The authors suggested that women suppressed potentially relationship-threatening perceptions. These results suggest a gender biased socialization which may predispose males to be more wary in interpersonal communication, in keeping with gender role expectations.

Camden et. al. (1984) found significant gender differences in motivation for telling "white lies." Women used white lies more than men (a) to avoid self-disclosure, and (b) to avoid interaction with others. The researchers explained the latter finding by concluding that women are the recipients of more undesired requests for "dates" than are men. This

study's results also indicated that women were more likely to use white lies to protect others' esteem, while men tended to use them to protect their own esteem. This finding is also in keeping with a traditional view of women as more nurturant of others than men are.

In examining recipient gender, Camden et al. found that when men were lying to women, the men used lies to protect their images in the eyes of the women. However, when women were lying to men, the women tended to use lies "for affiliation purposes, frequently negative" (p. 322). Again, this evidence reflects gender role expectations.

Finally, Maier and Lavrakos (1979) found that women felt that lies from men to women were more reprehensible than lies from women to men. Male subjects felt just the opposite.

The above findings offer some support to the conclusion that interpersonal deception patterns of men and women may reflect and reinforce gender stereotypes. However, the paucity of research and limited subject samples (Camden et al.'s findings were based on a population of only 20 subjects) suggest the need for further exploration of the gender variable.

The purpose of this study, as part of a larger naturalistic investigation of interpersonal deception among college-age youth, is to determine if (1) significant gender differences exist in (a) prevalence of deception, (b) motivation for deception, and (c) recipients of deception, and (2) if such differences support traditional gender role perceptions and expectations.

Procedures

Students enrolled in several undergraduate communication courses volunteered to record all instances of deception in which they engaged over a three-week period. An act of deception was defined as any of the following: lies (including white lies); half-truths; exaggeration; distortion; withholding pertinent information; cheating; stealing; hiding pertinent behavior; or any other conscious misrepresentation of truth. Written examples of each type of deception were reviewed in a pre-study training session. Truth was defined as, "what you believe to be true in a given situation." Subjects were instructed to complete a standardized "deception form" for each instance of deception as soon as possible after the incident. On

each form, the subjects were asked to record: (a) a description of the deception and deception situation; (b) recipient of the deception, including role relationship to subject, age, and gender; (c) perceived consequences of the deception, including whether or not it was believed; (d) imagined consequences if the subject had revealed the truth; as well as their own age and gender. Correct procedure for form completion was reviewed in the pre-study training session. No minimum or maximum number of completed forms was required.

Seventy-four subjects participated in the study, 50 women and 24 men. The range of completed forms submitted was from three to twenty-nine per subject, yielding a total of 940 instances of deception coded which were analyzed, 618 for women, 322 for men.

Coding

Judges coded each instance of deception for: (a) subject gender, (b) recipient gender, and (c) primary motivation for deception. The categories of motivation were allowed to emerge from the data. Eight primary reasons for deceptions emerged, containing a total of 16 subcategories. (See Table 1.)

One hundred ten acts were randomly selected for coding

by both judges. They agreed with one another in coding 91% of these acts. All sixteen categories of motivation were represented in the reliability sample, and the nine percent of the acts coded differently were not concentrated in any category.

Results

Frequency No significant difference in frequency of deception existed between the sexes. Male subjects averaged 13.4 deceptive acts over the three-week period, while female subjects averaged 12.4 acts.

Subject Motivation A significant difference ($p < .0024$, $\chi^2 = 35.05$, d.f. = 15) between sexes existed for primary motivation subcategories, although very weak (Cramer's V = .19). The same top five motivations for deception existed for both sexes, but in a different rank order. (See Table 2.) Differences appeared to lie primarily in: (a) "Request Acceptance" - men reported significantly more instances of deceptive compliance with undesirable requests than did women (the number one motive for males) which accounted for 17.7% of all male deception but only 9.9% of all female deception; (b) "Avoid Hurt Feelings" - women reported significantly more deceptive

acts motivated by a desire to avoid hurting the recipient than did men (the number one motive for women) - 15.5% of all women's deceptions but only 9% of all men's); and (c) "Third Party Protection" - women reported significantly more deceptive acts to protect a third party than did men (4.4% of women's deception but only 1.6% of the men's).

Recipients of Deception: All subjects

Significant differences were present in the crosstabulation of recipient gender and primary motivation categories ($p < .000$; $\chi^2 = 122.9$; d.f. = 30; Cramer's V = .26). (See Table 3.) These existed primarily in the following subcategories.

(a) "Avoid Hurt Feelings" - Nearly three times more women than men were the recipients of deception designed to protect their feelings (73.6% versus 26.4% of all deception in this category).

(b) "Avoid Interaction" - Nearly three times more men than women were the recipients of deception to avoid interaction (74.4% versus 25.6% of deception in this category).

(c) "Fidelity" - Nearly three times more men than women were the recipients of deception aimed at preserving an

image of fidelity in a relationship (75.6% versus 22% of deception in this category).

Recipients of Deception: Male Subjects Only

Significant differences in the crosstabulation of recipient gender and motivation categories were even stronger for male subjects alone ($p < .000$; $\chi^2 = 108.84$; d.f = 30; Cramer's V = .41). (See Table 4.) In addition to differences in the three motivation categories cited above, differences were evident in the following categories:

(a)"Request Refusal" - Males reported five times more instances of deceptively refusing resource requests from other men than from women (9.7% versus 2% of all male subject deception).

(b) "Obligation - Excuse" - men reported over four times more instances of deceptive excuses made to other men than to women (13.6% versus 2.7% of all male deception).

(c) "Resource Acquisition" - Men reported more instances of deceptively acquiring resources from other men than from women (11% versus 6.8% of all male deception).

Recipients of Deception: Female Subjects Only

A significant difference for female subjects alone in cross-tabulation of primary motivation and recipient

gender was found ($p < .000$; $\chi^2 = 99.76$; d.f. = 30; Cramer's V = .28). (See Table 5.) In addition to significant differences in the categories of Avoid Hurt Feelings, Avoid Interaction, and Fidelity cited under "All Subjects" above, differences emerged in the following categories:

(a) "Control of Others" - Women reported twice as many instances of deceptive manipulation of men than of women (5.5% versus 2.7% of all female deception).

(b) "Self-Protection" - women reported more instances of deceiving women than men to protect themselves (17.3% versus 13.3% of all female deception).

(c) "Obligation-Excuse" - The exact opposite of results for male subjects was found here, although the difference was not as great. Women reported more instances of deceptive excuses made to other women than to men (11.9% versus 8.5% of all female deception).

Discussion

Does Interpersonal Deception Reflect Gender Roles?

What She Doesn't Know Won't Hurt Her. The strongest gender differences in interpersonal deception revealed by this data sample lie in the area of deception to protect others. Women subjects reported significantly more deception to avoid hurting another's feelings and to protect a third party than did men. In addition, women were the recipients of deception aimed at protecting their feelings significantly more than men were. The findings reinforce and reflect the gender stereotype of the female as both weak and in need of protection, and as more nurturant and protective of others.

It's a Man's World. A less powerful difference which reflected gender role stereotypes was evident in deception over resources. Men reported significantly more instances of deception to protect and acquire resources from other men than from women. This finding may reflect the higher male involvement with resources and the competitive socialization around resources

traditionally provided for males in this culture. Males likely make more resource requests and attempts particularly to other males and likely deny more resources to males than females.

One subject's comment reflects key perceptual differences in resource control.

> I felt obligated to give it to her. If she was a guy I wouldn't have.

Feminine Wiles. Weaker evidence for gender role deception emerged in the area of relationship management and use of deception as a power strategy. First, women reported deceiving men more frequently than the reverse in order to preserve the illusion of fidelity to a relationship. This difference may reveal that females are held more responsible for evidence of fidelity based on a "double standard," or that females feel more responsible for active relationship maintenance. Second, women subjects reported attempts to deceptively manipulate the feelings and behavior of men more than the reverse, possibly reflecting the gender stereotype of "feminine wiles" used to offset the real or perceived power disadvantage of the woman.

The Weaker Sex. In contrast to the above findings, which apparently support gender stereotypes, the data revealed evidence which appears to disconfirm or at least question gender role expectations in one area. Men subjects reported significantly more instances of deceptive compliance with undesirable requests than did women. Such compliance is typically viewed as unassertive and more congruent with the female role stereotype. Though this finding may simply reflect an overall higher incidence of resource requests made to males, individual comments may provide an alternative explanation. In justifying why they complied, subjects commented that to say "no" to the request would mean

> I'd have to sit around all day explaining why

or

> She'd give me a big hassle and it wasn't worth the effort.

These comments reflect perceptions of competing resources--the future resource object of the deception and present time and energy. Decisions were made in favor of the "bird in the hand," so to speak. In addition, one subject stated:

> I told him yes, I'd like to come to his party,

figuring I could get out of it later.

Again, the subject was putting off the problem to avoid unpleasantness in the present. Viewed in light of these examples, the deceptive compliance of men in the study may not be truly "unassertive," but may reflect an unwillingness to deal openly with unpleasant feelings--a behavior more compatible with male stereotyping.

Sorry, I've got to wash my hair. In contrast to Camden et al's (1979) finding that women deceptively avoided interactions with men more frequently than with other women, both the men and women subjects deceptively avoided interactions with men significantly more than with women. This finding suggests that "undesirable date requests" are not the primary issue, as Camden et al. had previously concluded. Rather it may simply be more difficult to tell men "no" directly than it is to say "no" to women.

Catty Women Also, while Camden et al. found that his male subjects lied more to protect their esteem, neither sex in this study deceived significantly more for self-esteem purposes. However, women subjects deceived other women significantly more than men to protect their own

social image. This finding is perhaps in keeping with the stereotype of the female's distrust of her sisters, but likely is attributable to greater frequency of interaction involving personal information with other females than with males.

Gender and Authority. Finally, gender differences in the category of obligation-excuse are not easily understood. Both sexes reported significantly more instances of deceptive excuses to same sex recipients than to opposite sex recipients. However, the difference for male subjects was much greater. The large majority of these recipients were superiors--employers, professors, or parent figures. Did the male subjects select male employers and male professors, while the females selected their counterparts, so that incidence of deception reflects frequency of interaction? Or did subjects find it more preferable, easier, or safer somehow to deceive their same sex authority figures? This finding needs further investigation in order to clarify its significance.

CONCLUSIONS

Although this study lacks baseline data on frequency of interactions for subjects, the results nevertheless suggest that gender differences in interpersonal deception patterns do exist.

In addition, these differences apparently reflect and reinforce aspects of gender role stereotypes. Such stereotyping is most evident when examining recipient gender. Further study is needed to test the hypothesis that we tell different kinds of lies to men and women based on gender role typing. At present, it appears that, even in lying about who we are and what we are about, we may be revealing our social identities.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baird, John E., and Bradley, Patricia Hayes. (1979). "Styles of management and communication: a comparative study of men and women." Communication Monographs 46. Pgs. 101-111.

Bok, S. (1978). Lying: moral choice in public and private life. New York, N.Y.: Pantheon Books.

Breisinger, Gary D. (1976). "Sex and empathy, reexamined." Journal of Counseling Psychology, 23. Pgs. 289-290.

Camden, C., Motley, M.T., and Wilson, A. (1984). "White lies in interpersonal communication: a taxonomy and preliminary investigation of social motivations." Western Journal of Speech Communication. 48. Pgs 309-325.

DiPaulo, B.M., Zuckerman, M., and Rosenthal, R. (1980). "Humans as lie detectors." Journal of Communications. 30. Pgs. 129-139.

Eck, M. (1970). Lies and truth, trans. B. Murchland. London: Macmillan & Co.

Greenblatt, Lynda, Hasenauer, James E., and Freimuth, Vicki S. (1980). "Psychological sex type and androgyny in the study of communication variables: self-disclosure and communication apprehension." Human Communication Research. 6. Pgs. 117-129.

Hample, D. (1980). "Purposes and effects of lying." The Southern Speech Communication Journal. 46. Pgs. 33-47.

Hoffman, Martin L. (1977). "Sex differences in empathy and related behaviors." Psychological Bulletin. 84. Pgs. 712-722.

Knapp, M.L., and Comadena, M.E. (1979). "'Telling it like it isn't.' A review of theory and research on deceptive communications." Human Communications Research. 5. Pgs. 270-284.

Lippard, Paula V. (1986). "Ask me no questions,

I'll tell you no lies: situational exigencies for deception." In press. Western Speech Communication Journal. 52.

Maier, R.A., and Lavrakas, P.J. (1976). "Lying behavior and evaluation of lies." Perceptual and Motor Skills. 42. Pgs. 575-581.

Miller, Gerald R., Mongeau, Paula A., and Sleight, Carra. "Lying to lovers: deceptive communication in personal relationships." Convention paper, E.C.A. Convention, 1986.

Pearson, Judy Cornelia. (1985). Gender and communication. W.C. Brown Publ.: Dubuque, Iowa.

Stake, Jayne E., and Stake, Michael N. (1979). "Performance--self-esteem and dominance in mixed sex dyads." Journal of Personality. 47. Pgs. 23-26 and 71-84.

Turner, R.E., Edgely, C., and Olmstead, G. (1975). "Information control in conversation: honesty is not always the best policy." Kansas Journal of Sociology. 11. Pgs. 68-89.

Table 1.

Primary Motivation Categories.

I. Resources. Deception used to gain or protect material resources: money, property, food, information, etc.

A) Acquisition: Deception used to acquire resources from another.

B) Request-refusal: deception to prevent loss of resources.

II. Affiliation. Deception used to increase or decrease interaction with another.

A) Increase Interaction: Deception used to initiate or maintain a desired interaction.

B) Leavetaking: Deception used to discontinue interaction.

C) Interaction avoidance: Deception used to avoid an undesired interaction.

III. Self-Protection.

A) Social Image: Deception used to protect or enhance one's social image.

III. B) Self-disclosure Avoidance: Deception used to avoid undesired self-disclosure.

(table continued)

Table 1.

Primary Motivation Categories.

IV. Conflict avoidance.

A) Request Acceptance: Deception used to indicate willingness to fulfill an undesirable request in order to avoid disharmony, conflict, retaliation.

B) Lecture Avoidance: Deception used to prevent another from lecturing, criticizing, punishing subject.

C) Fidelity: Deception used to preserve image of fidelity to relationship.

V. Protection of Other.

A) Avoid Hurt Feelings: Deception used to avoid hurting another's feelings.

B) Avoid Worrying Another: Deception used to prevent another from worrying about subject's welfare.

V. C) Third Party: Deception used to benefit a third party, not the subject or the recipient.

VI. Manipulation of the Other.

Deception used to evoke guilt or other desired feeling in recipient, or to control other's behavior, causing recipient to behave in a desired manner.

(table continued)

Table 1.

Primary Motivation Categories.

VII. Obligation - Excuse.

Deception used to explain subject's failure or intended failure to meet an obligation and, thus, be excused from expected consequences.

VIII. Joke.

Deception used to trick another for the purpose of humor.

Table 2.

Top Six Primary Motivation Categories by Gender.

Females	No. of Deceptions	% Total Dec.
1. Avoid Hurt Feelings	96	15.5
2. Lecture Avoidance	81	13.1
3. Self Protection	81	13.1
4. Obligation-Excuse	63	10.2
5. Request Acceptance	61	9.9
6. Resource Acquisition	50	8.1
	432	69.9%
Males		
1. Request Acceptance	57	17.7
2. Self-Protection	49	15.2
3. Lecture Avoidance	34	10.6
4. Avoid Hurt Feelings	29	9.0
5. Resource Acquisition	28	8.7
6. Obligation-Excuse	28	8.7
	225	69.9%

Table 3.

Crosstabulation of Recipient Gender by Primary Motivation: All Subjects.

Recipient Gender		(1) IA	IB	IIA	IIB	IIC	IIIA	IIIB	IVA	IVB	IVC	VA	VB	VC	VI	VII	VIII	RAW TOTALS
		(2) 40	26	3	13	29	54	9	54	46	31	33	1	13	21	44	8	425
Male		(3) 9.4	6.1	.7	3.1	6.8	12.7	2.1	12.7	10.8	7.3	7.8	.2	3.1	4.9	10.4	1.9	45.2
		(4) 51.3	59.1	30.0	44.8	74.4	41.5	36.0	45.8	40.0	75.6	26.4	8.3	40.6	56.8	48.4	57.1	
		37	17	7	16	10	71	12	63	57	9	92	8	19	16	44	5	483
Female		7.7	3.5	1.4	3.3	2.1	14.7	2.5	13.0	11.8	1.9	19.0	1.7	3.9	3.3	9.1	1.0	51.4
		47.4	38.6	70.0	55.2	25.6	54.6	48.0	53.4	49.6	22.0	73.6	66.7	59.4	43.2	48.4	35.7	
		1	1				5	4	1	12	1		3			3	1	32
Both		3.1	3.1				15.6	12.5	3.1	37.5	3.1		9.4			9.4	3.1	3.4
		1.3	2.3				3.8	16.0	.8	10.4	2.4		25.0			3.3	7.1	
Column		78	44	10	29	39	130	25	118	115	41	125	12	32	37	91	14	940
Totals		8.3	4.7	1.1	3.1	4.1	13.8	2.7	12.6	12.2	4.4	13.3	1.3	3.4	3.9	9.7	1.5	100.0

(1) See Table 1 for Category Titles

(2) Number of Deceptions

(3) Percentage of Total Deceptions for Gender

(4) Percentage of Total Deceptions in that Motivation Category

Table 4.

Crosstabulation of Recipient Gender by Primary Motivation: Male Subjects Only.

Recipient Gender	(1)	IA	IB	IIA	IIB	IIC	IIIA	IIIB	IVA	IVB	IVC	VA	VB	VC	VI	VII	VIII	RAW TOTALS
Male	(2)	17	15		3	11	24	3	26	14		8		3	6	21	3	154
	(3)	60.7	83.3		25.0	78.6	49.0	33.3	45.6	41.2		27.6		60.0	46.2	75.0	75.0	47.8
	(4)	11.0	9.7		1.9	7.1	15.6	1.9	16.9	9.1		5.2		1.9	3.9	13.6	1.9	
Female		10	3	6	9	3	23	2	30	13	9	21	5	2	7	4	1	148
		35.7	16.7	100.0	75.0	21.4	46.9	22.2	52.6	38.2	100.0	72.4	71.4	40.0	53.8	14.3	25.0	46.0
		6.8	2.0	4.1	6.1	2.0	15.5	1.4	20.3	8.8	6.1	14.2	3.4	1.4	4.7	2.7	.7	
Both		1					2	4	1	7			2			3		20
		3.6					4.1	44.4	1.8	20.6			28.6			10.7		6.2
		5.0					10.0	20.0	5.0	35.0			10.0			15.0		
Column Totals		28	18	6	12	14	49	9	57	34	9	29	7	5	13	28	4	322
		8.7	5.6	1.9	3.7	4.3	15.2	2.8	17.7	10.6	2.8	9.0	2.2	1.6	4.0	8.7	1.2	100.0

(1) See Table 1 for Category Titles

(2) Number of Deceptions

(3) Percentage of Total Deceptions for Gender

(4) Percentage of Total Deceptions in that Motivation Category

Table 5.

Crosstabulation of Recipient Gender by Primary Motivation: Female Subjects Only.

Recipient Gender	(1)	IA	IB	IIA	IIB	IIC	IIIA	IIIB	IVA	IVB	IVC	VA	VB	VC	VI	VII	VIII	RAW TOTALS
Male	(2)	23	11	3	10	18	30	6	28	32	31	25	1	10	15	23	5	271
	(3)	46.0	42.3	75.0	58.8	72.0	37.0	37.5	45.9	39.5	96.9	26.0	20.0	37.0	62.5	36.5	50.0	43.9
	(4)	8.5	4.1	1.1	3.7	6.6	11.1	2.2	10.3	11.8	11.8	9.2	.4	3.7	5.5	8.5	1.8	
Female		27	14	1	7	7	48	10	33	44		71	3	17	9	40	4	335
		54.0	53.8	25.0	41.2	28.0	59.3	62.5	54.1	54.3		74.0	60.0	63.0	37.5	63.5	40.0	54.2
		8.1	4.2	3	2.1	2.1	14.3	3.0	9.9	13.1		21.2	.9	5.1	2.7	11.9	1.2	
Both			.1				3			5	1		1				1	12
			3.8				3.7			6.2	3.1		20.0				10.0	1.9
			8.3				25.0			41.7	8.3		.9				8.3	
Column		50	26	4	17	25	81	16	61	81	32	96	5	27	24	63	10	618
Totals		8.1	4.2	.6	2.8	4.0	13.1	2.6	9.9.	13.1	5.2	15.5	.8	4.4	3.9	10.2	1.6	100.0

(1) See Table 1 for Category Titles

(2) Number of Deceptions

(3) Percentage of Total Deceptions for Gender

(4) Percentage of Total Deceptions in that Motivation Category